

## REMARKS

Applicants respectfully request entry of this amendment on the grounds that it is believed that the current amendment places the claims in condition for allowance. Furthermore, the instant amendment places the claims in better condition for an appeal.

In paragraph 6 of the Office action, independent claims 1, 6 and 27 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Higham et al. in view of Arnold. Claims 1, 6 and 27 have been amended to state that the processor controls a numeric display on at least one of the plurality of shelves within the cabinet, wherein the display indicates the number of different variety of items on the list of items to be located that are held by that shelf. Support for the amendment may be found, for example, at paragraph [0036]. As stated in paragraph [0036], if one item is located on that shelf, the alphanumeric display 48 flashes the number "1". If two items are located, the display flashes the number "2", etc. Thus, if the healthcare worker is looking for Tylenol and Ibuprofen, and both of those items are located on the same shelf, the shelf level display associated with that shelf will display the number 2, indicating that two different varieties of items to be located are carried by the shelf associated with the shelf-level display.

In contrast, in Arnold, there is no shelf-level numeric display nor is there any display that is operative to display a number that is the number of different variety of items to be located which are carried by the shelf associated with the display. For example, as discussed at column 9, beginning at line 26, "adjacent each of item buttons 86 is a visual indicator 88 to assist the caregiver in locating a particular item. Alternatively, item buttons 86 may be configured to illuminate, thereby eliminating the need for visual indicators 88." Because Arnold does not provide the teaching missing from Higham et al., it is respectfully submitted that the rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) cannot be maintained.

In paragraph 4 of the Office action, claim 27 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by Arnold et al. Claim 27 has been amended in a manner similar to claims 1

Appl. No.: 10/010,387  
Amdt. Dated: November 15, 2004  
Reply to Office action of July 16, 2004

and 6. For the reasons discussed above in connection with the obviousness rejection, applicants believe that claim 27 is also in condition for allowance.

Applicants have made a diligent effort to place the instant application in condition for allowance. Accordingly, a Notice of Allowance for claims 1-8 and 24-27 is earnestly requested. If the examiner is of the opinion that the instant application is in condition for disposition other than through allowance, the examiner is respectfully requested to contact applicants' attorney at the telephone number listed below so that additional changes may be discussed.

Respectfully submitted,



Edward L. Pencoske  
Reg. No. 29,688  
Thorp Reed & Armstrong LLP  
One Oxford Centre, 14<sup>th</sup> Floor  
Pittsburgh, PA 15219-1425  
(412) 394-7789  
Attorneys for Applicants

Dated: 15 November 2004